

working hard for the last 11 months to achieve one, and certainly if we see progress, which I hope we see more of in the ensuing days, we are willing to work hard next week to achieve that final outcome in a bipartisan manner.

But as the leader knows, we also, if he could indicate to us, if that is going to be December 24 or 23, that is helpful for us as we make plans. It is also helpful for us in many ways as we try to plan out our work schedule and our family schedules.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the point the gentleman makes.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, what I see and what we see expressed here, we have 435 people here that share a commitment to their families and a commitment to the Nation through their work here, and we are all caught in a period of dire consequences and serious stress, trying to find a way, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] said so eloquently a few years back, to get home and love our children, and I can only say that insofar as I can do anything to accommodate the Members and their families while also accommodating to their sincere desire to complete the year's work in a responsible fashion, I will make that effort, and I will try to keep the Members as advised and as current as I can possibly do with any certainty at any time.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for that, Mr. Leader. I just have one final question.

Two days ago the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducted a rule change concerning the book royalty issue. It is a long-overdue reform. It was unanimously approved by the committee. The chairwoman has clearly indicated that the bill would be considered before the end of this session.

We are concerned by press reports we saw in the paper this morning indicating that the leadership on your side of the aisle may be blocking the committee's unanimous recommendation, and I guess my question to you this afternoon is will the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct recommendation for immediate action be honored by the Republican leadership? And can we see this bill within the next week?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for your inquiry.

As the gentleman knows, a bill has been drafted and has been submitted, assigned to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules has the bill under consideration, and I cannot tell you with any degree of certainty what will be the dispatch of that bill by the committee, but I am confident that the Committee on Rules will act on this bill in full regard to its own fine traditions as a committee and the kind of consideration that such legislation takes, and I have to tell you I have had only a very, very brief discussion with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and a discussion in which he has assured me that the bill would get all

the serious consideration in the due course of time that is appropriate within the traditions of this fine committee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So I guess the other question is, though, when will this be acted on? Because the hope had been, by this unanimous decision of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to move on this, that it would be done before we went home. And since we have all of this extra time and the budget has not been solved, is there anything blocking this from coming up right now?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I will just say to the gentleman, the bill is in the committee of jurisdiction. The committee of jurisdiction has the jurisdiction. It is not at all unusual, I dare say, every individual Member who drops a bill in the hopper does so with the sincere hope that it will be acted on immediately. That rarely is the case, and there are procedures known best to the committee, and I do not think it is appropriate for me as a Member or as the majority leader to second-guess how a committee will exercise its jurisdiction.

I think we have committees, and each committee has its own manner of operating, and I do not think that it would be appropriate for me to speculate on the manner in which this committee nor any other committee would dispense with a bill.

□ 1415

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina).

Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### WEI JINGSHENG'S SENTENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the People's Republic of China imposed a harsh new prison sentence on its most prominent human rights campaigner, Wei Jingsheng. Today the New York Times in translation has presented us with the reasons that the People's Republic of China has meted out this draconian

sentence against its leading human rights activist. The charge, according to the People's Republic of China, was overthrowing the government, overthrowing the government, and what did this man who is nominated by many in this body for the Nobel Peace Prize do to cause the People's Republic of China to charge him, and convict him, and sentence him for overthrowing the government? Let me read from the Chinese Government statement about the conviction, quote:

The court's investigation showed that Wei, in attempting to overthrow the government, developed a plan of action which included establishing an organization to raise funds to support democratic movement activities.

Well, that is true enough. Wei Jingsheng has long been an advocate for democracy in the People's Republic of China. He was a leader in the democracy wall movement which took its name from the wall near the city where democratic activists hung their pro-freedom manifestos. He served over 14 years in prison labor camps in China where, according to reliable reports, he was beaten and tortured. Now having been out of prison for only a few months, Mr. Speaker, he was charged and convicted again for promoting democracy.

Let me read further from the government's statement:

He is responsible for purchasing newspapers, setting up a company in charge of organizing cultural activities.

All of these things got him a prison sentence, keep in mind, colleagues: Organizing nongovernmental painting exhibitions, performances, and publications.

Wei Jingsheng worked actively to implement the above plans, quoted the Chinese Government. He bought 12½ percent of the shares of an urban credit cooperative in Beijing to start setting up a democracy movement bank, and he wrote and set an introduction to projects for assistance to people in charge of an overseas organization and asked for hundreds of thousands of U.S. dollars to fund his activities. He also registered a company in Hong Kong and used the name of the company to prepare art exhibitions in Beijing so as to recruit people in organizations that would be sympathetic to him. Wei Jingsheng also secretly connected some people both in China and abroad to study struggle strategies, conspiring to unite the illegal organizations in China, by which they mean the illegal pro-democracy organizations in China, and act when the right moment comes. He also used illegal means—now I am again quoting from the People's Republic of China official statement of yesterday:

"\* \* \* and published a series of articles overseas to slander and attack the Chinese Government, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the Socialist system, and to advocate the independence of Tibet, something that another Nobel laureate, another Nobel Peace Prize winner, is guilty of. He and the enemy forces overseas, among which we may number ourselves in this body, echo

each other and try to create publicity. Certainly that is worthy of a prison sentence, to overthrow the people's democratic dictatorship, sabotage the Socialist system, and separate the country.

Wei Jingsheng will be in jail for another 14 years, and the response from the Clinton administration has been deafening. One of our Democratic colleagues said yesterday, "I think the administration policy is a dismal failure in every respect, and I think the sentence is a slap in the face." The New York Times notes today that the Clinton administration, while criticizing China, stopped conspicuously short of threatening specific retaliatory action.

Mr. Speaker, even our Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights said only, "We urge the Chinese authorities to show clemency." Clemency, colleagues, is due someone who is guilty. Wei Jingsheng is innocent, he is an innocent man wrongly charged, and this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, should band together in his support.

#### TREATING OUR FELLOW MEMBERS WITH RESPECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk very briefly about something that is concerning me very deeply, especially in light of some of the debate or lack of debate that took place in this Chamber last night on the Bosnian question.

President Bush referred to a growing mood on Capitol Hill as a climate of ugliness, and President Thomas Jefferson talked about, when he wrote the manual that we all read as new Members of Congress and try to refresh our memories about the rules of civility and comity in this body; we all read Thomas Jefferson's words, and he stated, and I quote:

It is very material that order, decency and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as the debate spirals downward at times and people resort to the temptation of name-calling, and finger-pointing, and fisticuffs rather than camaraderie, and civility, and community, that we not only hurt bipartisanship in this body now and in the future, but I think we tear at the fabric of what Americans deeply respect about this institution and what they want us to do today, and that is to work together to solve some of our problems in a bipartisan way on the budget, on making Congress work more efficiently and effectively, of downsizing Government, particularly committees and subcommittees here in this body, and that we can do it in a civil manner, being civil to one another.

My very first vote, Mr. Speaker, 4½ years ago as a new Member of Congress was on the Persian Gulf, and I was in-

ducted into this body with such a deep sense of awe and respect not because George Washington's picture is in this body, not because In God We Trust is above the flag here in this Chamber, but because Members treat each other with respect, and although we had disagreement on the timing of going to war, everybody respected the differences in opinion, and everybody was a patriot.

Last night's debate did not include that kind of respect, and I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, on a quote from Speaker Joe Cannon who once said:

It is true we engage in fierce combat, we are often intense partisans, sometimes we are unfair, not infrequently unjust, brutal at times, and yet I venture to say, taken as a whole the House is sound at heart. Nowhere else will you find such a ready appreciation of merit and character. In few gatherings in equal size is there so little jealousy and envy.

I think the first part of that statement is very true, Mr. Speaker. We do have fierce partisanship at times, but we should always have the nature and character of civility which is reflected in our rules come to the forefront, be held at the highest respect and esteem for all Members, and that we continue to work in a bipartisan way for what is best for the American people.

□ 1415

#### FUNDING AMERICA'S DEFENSE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]. I think he was right on the ball. I do not necessarily agree with the strategy or the tactics used by the House, and I probably would have supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] if it had—I did not fight to get that unanimous consent removed.

As I stated in my opening remarks last night, I thought all the Members across the board had good intentions in this thing. I would support that. I would also tell my friend that quite often when we sit on this side of the aisle, we feel that there is a lot of misinformation on Medicare, that there are no cuts and different things, and a different way to get to education, and it is difficult to come to those terms sometimes when you are getting slammed down on the ground all the time. I would work, and I know the gentleman does, and I know how he works, and I know that he himself would do that. The problem sometimes is with leadership. I would work with the gentleman.

Let me go to the issue that I want to talk about.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say, as

classmates and people who serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, you and I do work in a bipartisan way on many occasions, and I have a great amount of respect for you. When we had the Persian Gulf debate, and as a former war hero, you have added a great deal to the debate we have had on military matters.

I just have a deep, deep regret and a heavy heart when we have the kind of lack of civility that took place in the body last night on a unanimous-consent motion, on a resolution supporting not the mission—with which I disagree—in Bosnia, but the confidence in our troops and the support for our troops, which I wholly agree with. I would hope that we could have agreed to that unanimous consent last night.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about a little today, and I do not have time to do it fully, and it is not on a partisan issue, is that many of us voted last night on our consciences, and feeling that we were doing the best thing for our troops overseas. My concern, as I stated, is not the votes last night, Mr. Speaker. My concern is what comes in the future, that we hear people say they want to support the troops, they want to make sure that they do not come back in body bags; that they come back.

There are legitimate issues on how much we should spend for defense and how much not. But remember when the President ran in his campaign, he said a \$50 billion defense cut would put us into a hollow force, and then in his first tax bill would put us at a \$177 billion defense deficit, would decrease defense.

Because of some of the different environments we go to in the world, with Haiti and Somalia, the different areas, and I am not going to go through the negative of those, but it has put us even further below what the requirements of defense are. GAO has said we are \$200 billion below the bottoms-up review. The bottoms-up review was, remember, drafted by then-Secretary Les Aspin and the President to see what our needs would be to be able to fight two conflicts, and the minimum we would need to be able to do that. When you are \$200 billion below that, then it tells you that you need to put some more dollars into national security for this country.

Some people on the debate tomorrow will say that there is more in this Defense authorization bill than the President asked for. This is true. But as I take a look, let me give you a couple of examples.

The F-15 Strike Eagle, the Air Force has not bought a single airplane in 3 years because of the budget. They are using the F-15 Strike Eagles in Bosnia today, out of Italy and other places. They are also using the F-16. The Navy